

# Exhibit 34

---

**From:** Rosenberg, Jared I  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 7:33 PM  
**To:** Felder, Andrea D; Kolb, Jennifer; Garcia Smith, Jazmin  
**Subject:** Reading Proposal

**Importance:** High

Attached is the promised reading proposal. Please spend some time reading through it and make suggestions, as needed, about content and phrasing. A few notes:

1 – There are a few ideas in this proposal that we did not specifically address in our meetings. I thought of some additional suggestions as I put thoughts onto paper. You'll be able to pick them out and feel free to comment on them and/or suggest I'm nuts for proposing them.

2 – I spent some time reviewing calendar dates. I listed important dates in the last section of the proposal. I plan to make a new draft of the calendar with these dates for BP. You will notice I made the D2 first-read period six weeks (instead of five). The reasons why are listed in the proposal.

3 – I gave a brief overview of this proposal in our Seniors meeting today. It was well received with minimal concern. I think it will be important to tell BP that we have support for this plan from multiple readers outside this working group.

Please get any feedback to me by Thursday at Noon and let me know if you have any questions.

Great work everyone – I truly appreciate the time you took to get this proposal created.

Jared

Jared Rosenberg  
Senior Assistant Director of Admissions  
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Phone: (919) 966-3988

Fax: (919) 962-3045

[jrosenberg@unc.edu](mailto:jrosenberg@unc.edu)

[www.unc.edu](http://www.unc.edu)

# Reading Plan Proposal – One-Read System

## September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013

Working Group: Jared, Andrea, Jen Kolb, Jazmin

### **1 DIRECTIVE**

---

Our group was asked to develop two potential reading plans for the upcoming 2013-2014 school year. The crux of these plans would be to give each application one, thorough read instead of two individual reads, which has been the status quo for past reading cycles. The group was asked to keep in mind our primary office goals, which include “being respectful of, and providing great care to, those students who put their time, energy, effort and money into applying to UNC.” The group was asked to weigh the pros and cons of our plans and consider the efficiency of any potential structure.

### **2 PROCESS**

---

Before convening as a working group, we participated in larger office discussions about the consequences (positive and negative) of moving to a one-read system. Feedback was solicited through meetings with groups of readers, as well as individuals. We then met several times to work through the details of our plan. Once our working group meetings commenced, we also asked several seasonal readers for their professional judgment on how a one-read system may impact our process, as well as their standing within our larger reading committee. All of these meetings have led to the plans we now propose.

### **3 THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO PLANS**

---

The two plans we propose have similar main tenets, but differ on one key point, which is how to distinguish, and as a result review again, applications that initial readers decide need further review for a myriad of reasons. These might include but are not limited to: (a) special circumstances or unique context the applicant provides and (b) special applicant accomplishments that may heighten a reader’s wish to admit a student despite one or more average/below average academic indicators. Our two ideas to handle this issue are addressed later in this proposal.

## 4 FIRST READS

---

The first read system will not change under either proposed plan. Jared will distribute first reads each morning as they become ready to read. Our plan suggests more time will be given to first reads than in past years since we propose to eliminate automatic second reads for all applications. More emphasis will be placed on the first reader's rating accuracy and comments (more on this later in this proposal). Readers have previously suggested they could complete approximately six first reads per hour. Under our proposal, we decided that 4 ½ first reads per hour would be the new expectation given the few extra minutes we can now afford the initial read in the absence of automatic second reviews. Again, this extra time would go to rating accuracy, comments and thoughtfully arriving at an admissions decision.

First reads would be completed during an initial five-week review period during D1 review and an initial six-week period during D2 review. The extra week is needed for D2 reading due to the processing deadlines, D1 H/M review and to account for two days of a reading freeze when D1 decisions are released. First reads will be distributed with 60% divided among seasonal readers and 40% divided among year-round readers. If we assume 4 ½ first reads per hour and approximately 14,000 ready to read applications available during each first-read period (which mirrors the availability of ready to read applications from last year), seasonal readers would have 26-28 hours of reading per week, on average, during each first-read period, and year-round readers would have 15-17 hours of reading per week, on average, during each first-read period. Again, these statistics assume a 60%/40% distribution ratio. These figures are also based on 14 seasonal readers, which is our expected number this year, and 17 year-round readers, which assumes both open Assistant Director positions (communications and general) will be filled in-time for reading season. Steve, Barbara, Allison, Melissa F, Becky and Ashley are not counted as year-round readers. All other Senior Assistant and Assistant Directors are factored into the reader counts.

Under this proposal, all year-round readers will receive an equal amount of first reads (in other words, the 40% would be divided among the 17 readers), regardless of other primary office responsibilities. The justification for equal distribution is everyone will have an already-reduced reading load compared to last year by eliminating consistent 2<sup>nd</sup> reads. We each have primary office duties, but the thought is we can each handle 15-17 hours of reading per week for the two first-read periods and anything less would not allow that reader to be fully invested in the reading process. However, as will be stated in this proposal, we would recommend some readers not participate in the decision/SGR review (explained later in this proposal) and use that time to focus on specialized job functions specific to their areas of expertise and responsibility. We also discussed this aspect of the proposal with Julie, Ashley (as her supervisor) and others who had reduced reading loads in past years. They support this idea.

## 5 SECOND READS / EXTRA “LOOKS”

---

Here is where the two plans differ. Most readers have suggested we include the chance for an application to be flagged for another “read” or “quick look.” The working group weighed possible options very carefully to respect readers’ wishes while also considering how select alternatives may add additional reading time to our schedules. In other words, we wanted to provide an avenue for select second looks without causing an overabundance of additional reads simply because the option was

available for readers. Regardless of the “nuts and bolts” of the second look process, we agreed that a reasonable goal would be to flag no more than 15-20% of applications for this secondary review. In all cases, comments become key to focus the second reader on the main issue(s) with the application. Here are the two plans we propose along with our preference.

## 5.1 FLAGGING APPLICATIONS AS WE READ FOR CLOSER SCRUTINY DURING SGR/DECISION REVIEW

**(THIS IS THE PLAN THE WORKING GROUP ENDORSES AS OUR FIRST CHOICE).**

This plan is very simple. Readers check a box on the right for “further review” when it is warranted. This flag appears on the SGR reports and alerts those doing the decision review that an application should be opened and reviewed again within the context of the school and in light of our review directives (scale back admit, etc.). While we will never have the time or need to open every application during a decision review, this flag will guarantee that the application is indeed opened, reread and reconsidered.

**PROS:** This plan moves any closer scrutiny of applications to the decision review period, allowing for no interruptions as we spend our weeks completing first-reads. It also flags applications to be reviewed in the context of the school.

**CONS:** Is it too easy to just check a box and will that result in too many “further reviews?” Will we have even more OOS admits than in the past since our readers tend to lean in the direction of the student when conflicted? Also, it is one more box to check in an already crowded column? Finally, readers do not get the benefit of immediate feedback from others as they read.

## 5.2 ASKING FOR SECOND LOOKS AS WE COMPLETE FIRST READS

This plan, while fairly simple in nature, could be done in several different ways. In all these scenarios, a “formal” 2<sup>nd</sup> read would not be done, but we would instead simply give feedback to the first reader to help them along with a decision. If we did formal 2<sup>nd</sup> reads with 2<sup>nd</sup> decisions, applications may then require third reads, which would still be followed by the same extensive decision/SGR review. We felt this was taking too much time at the individual read level.

Some of the suggested methods include (a) applications needing further review are moved into a general 2<sup>nd</sup> read location where they are distributed every few days to all readers. Readers would then give feedback to the 1<sup>st</sup> reader via email or through comments on the evaluation summary without a formal vote, (b) reading in smaller 5-6 person teams and first readers would call on their team members (rotating through the teammates one-by-one) to give them feedback without a formal vote, or (c) pairing all readers with a partner whom they could call on for feedback and rotate pairings weekly to give readers different perspectives. **If we went with this plan (5.2), the group supports option C as the simplest and least intrusive.** Again, in all three of these scenarios, we would not be asking readers doing the “quick looks” to make a formal decision.

**PROS:** Allows readers to get feedback while completing first reads. It also allows for more interaction among readers that we would lose by eliminating weekly committee meetings. It may also reduce the number of initial OOS admits. We expect many readers to lean to admitting when on the fence and some direct feedback may reduce these numbers.

**CONS:** This would interrupt readers from completing their batch of first reads. Regardless of any 2<sup>nd</sup> review, we would still perform a much more thorough decision/SGR review anyway, which would likely change hundreds of decisions. In other words, it may not be a good use of time and resources.

## 6 SGR / DECISION REVIEW

---

If we eliminate the majority or all of our 2<sup>nd</sup> reads, our decision review becomes much more important. Many readers have asked to become more involved in this process since decision review really shapes and fine-tunes our class. Using up to six readers and three weeks of time per reader has still forced us to move quicker than we would like during previous reviews.

Our plan suggests we include up to 20 readers in this review, and they would work in pairs. The pairings would allow for collaboration amongst readers that would be missing from larger weekly committee meetings. We also believe including a majority of readers in our review will add more accountability as we complete first reads. Using the mantra “do unto others,” readers would have more investment in ensuring ratings and comments were accurate and complete. After all, they and/or other readers will see them again. The pairs would be assigned to either NC or OOS review for the duration of the process. How many pairs we assign to NC and OOS would depend on the course of action we need to take with each group. For example, we may need more manpower on OOS due to the immense number of pullbacks. The 10-11 readers not involved in the decision review would be responsible for continuing to read stragglers or attending to other responsibilities in their areas. We envision the communications directors being able to spend those decision review weeks focusing on non-reading tasks. Readers working with DOS and other major end-of-deadline processes could focus their time on those responsibilities. When all is said and done, we think 5-6 readers will read stragglers during the review.

Once our first-read periods are completed, we would take a day and run numbers to determine the actions to take in the upcoming decision review. During this time, all readers would attend a decision review training session. We envision a much more in-depth training than in past years, perhaps lasting the better part of a day. It would include not only practice reviews, but a comprehensive look at our numbers and a detailed outline of our review game plan (i.e. pulling back OOS admits, etc.). The thought is readers will work individually for a week, make some of their decision changes on their own and then work together on tougher cases or schools. We would allow just over two weeks for this “pair” review. With the increased manpower and no first reads to distract them, readers can work more slowly and methodically as they review decisions, which include opening all the applications marked for “further review” during the initial read. Once this review period ends, most of the readers will begin reading in earnest our D2 applications. We will then run numbers again and determine any needed last-review tweaking. This extra tweaking would be done by BP, Steve (if available) and 2-3 additional, high-experience readers. The time frame for this second decision review would depend on the amount of work still needed. In the case of early action, opportunity exists to release decisions earlier than originally planned.

The group also proposes adding ethnicity back to the SGR reports. Ethnicity is one of many factors we may consider, alongside other aspects already flagged on the SGR reports, which include FGC, Alum, DOS, Athletics, Music/Drama and Sub-D. Adding ethnicity just adds one additional piece of information to consider.

## 7 STRAGGLERS

---

The group debated how to review stragglers, which we define as any application needing a first read after the decision/SGR begins. This may include late-completing applicants (i.e. did not receive transcript until December) or those lingering in Further Action. Since the decision review acts as a de facto 2<sup>nd</sup> review, how can we ensure fairness to those we read later in the review cycle? A few options were discussed.

One option is to move those D1 applications to D2 for review. Without the necessary documents in a timely manner, they may be better reviewed in D2 review and with the D2 decision/SGR review. We realize this may not be a popular option given our propensity to want to benefit the student, but one could argue they may have a greater chance of admission if reviewed in the same manner as all other applicants. Still, the question of then how to handle D2 stragglers remains.

Another option is to ensure all applications that receive their initial decision AFTER our decision review begins receive a glance as part of the secondary decision review conducted by BP, Steve and 2-3 additional readers. A query can easily be run based on decision date.

## 8 COMMENTS

---

There will be increased focus on first reader comments under this proposal. The time increase allotted for first reads this year (down from six first reads per hour to 4 ½ first reads per hour) should be reflected in more accurate ratings, more thorough comments and more thoughtful decisions. We want comments to be a focus of training (discussed later in this proposal) this year and touch on all the primary considerations of the application decision – program, performance, ECs, essays and PQ. One suggestion is ask readers to write a few words in the space provided next to each rating. This can be a checklist to ensure comments encompass all parts of the review. Comments in these spaces would be limited to what can be viewed on the evaluation summary page without any scrolling sideways or down. The comment box below the ratings would summarize and formulate the reasoning behind the proposed decision, as well as discuss special talents and extenuating circumstances that may impact the proposed decision (again see below for the section on training).

In the case when a reader nominates an applicant for “special opportunities,” a comment pinpointing the reasons will be required, which may include simply nominating the student for “Excel at Carolina.”

## 9 H/M (SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES) REVIEW

---

Honors and Merit review will continue with the same plan as previous years with one exception. We will no longer ask faculty to help us with the initial review of all H/M applicants. Instead, we will rely on our own experienced readers. Time saved by not doing individual 2<sup>nd</sup> reads can also be added to this important task. A team of readers (approximately 10-12) will spend a few days near the end of each deadline review reading through the applications marked for “special consideration.” This review will net us the students invited to our two Scholarship Days. One advantage of our proposed one-read plan is an earlier calendar for our SGR/Decision review, which positively impacts our H/M review. Since

several “special opportunity” applicants will be pulled back from admit during the OOS decision review, the H/M review will never need to consider those students, thereby saving the time spent on this additional review. This also allows additional vetting of D2 H/M candidates since invitations for the D2 Scholarship Day must be sent prior to locking-in D2 decisions. Under our overall proposal, the D2 decision review will take place mostly in February rather than March, which is when D2 Scholarship Day invitations are mailed.

## 10 TRAINING, BP'S ROLE, EXTENDED R&R MEETINGS

---

Our proposal suggests some minor changes to our overall training model. Ongoing training would take place through a combination of (a) specified training days, (b) extended R&R meetings and (c) BP's daily or weekly checks for accuracy in ratings, complete comments and thoughtfulness in decisions.

### **Specified Training Days:**

**October 31<sup>st</sup> and November 1<sup>st</sup>** will be all-day training days. In addition to reviewing processes and procedures for reading, an emphasis will be placed on comment writing and the review of underrepresented, low SES and FGC applicants. In fact, a half day spent on overall diversity training may be in order. These are categories that require more training due to a higher variance in our decisions (per JK's research) and their key importance towards meeting our office and University goals of providing access and creating a diverse incoming class. If we realize upon creating this two-day schedule that we do not have enough time to adequately address these issues, we would propose adding the following Tuesday morning (Nov. 5<sup>th</sup>, 8:30am – 12pm) for additional training time.

**Decision/SGR Training:** We will identify at least a 3-4 hour training period for all readers to prepare for Decision/SGR review. These training periods (one for each deadline) will take place just after each first-read period. They will be led by Barbara, Jared and others who have experience with our decision reviews.

**Transfer Training:** Transfer reading is discussed below, but we would have a transfer training day prior to the start of transfer review. Only those participating in transfer review would be required to attend (again, see below).

### **Extended R&R:**

In lieu of 10 separate, weekly committee meetings, we propose adding an hour to R&R each Tuesday (likely 9:40am – 10:40am after a 10-minute break) to review applications together. We suggest 10 separate committees meeting independently of each other are not able to calibrate, which has been a trumpeted reason for continuing committee. While the applications reviewed during these meetings can represent UR, low SES and FGC students in an effort to increase our calibration, they should not be limited to just those categories and should include many types of applicants and scenarios. The PIDs for these applications will be distributed on Fridays, and readers are expected to review them prior to our R&R meetings. The PIDs will be a combination of reader-suggested and BP-suggested cases (see below). We expect if readers spend one hour reviewing the cases in advance and another hour discussing them in R&R, it equates to the two hours gained by eliminating committee.

### **BP's Role (outside of Decision/SGR):**

Our proposal asks Barbara to spend a dedicated amount of time each day/week checking behind readers. The primary focus would be rating accuracy (APs, etc.), thoroughness of comments and well out-of-line decisions. "Well out-of-line decisions" could be defined as any decision for which Barbara feels the vast majority (85% or more) of readers would vote differently. We want to distinguish "out-of-line decisions" from decisions that just may cause a 50/50 split among readers. Barbara would then give direct feedback to readers based on her findings. If Barbara does not have adequate time for these checks, we propose one or two additional experienced readers assist. The goal is to provide every reader with feedback (even if it's "great job") during their initial first read period.

## **11 TRANSFER READING**

---

We propose a very similar one-read plan for transfer reading. Transfer reading would begin in early March, which is after the majority of the D2 Decision/SGR review. We will have a one-day training session for transfer reading. We would ask approximately 14 readers to read transfer applications. This group would consist of 10 seasonal readers and four year-round readers. After March 21<sup>st</sup>, this group would consist of four seasonal readers and the same four year-round readers. The involved year-round readers would not be asked to recruit or dean while they focus on completing transfer applications. Utilizing a smaller group for transfers should provide more consistency with decisions. Also, the majority of the recruitment staff can focus on spring recruitment, programs and yield activities. Seasonal readers not reading transfers would continue to review D2 stragglers in March.

Each application would receive one, thorough read. Time saved from eliminating 2<sup>nd</sup> reads can be added to first reads with similar expectations for accuracy and comments. We recommend utilizing the same "further review" box to identify applicants who should get another thorough look during the transfer decision review. Alternatively, we could use the pairing/group method also outlined earlier in the proposal.

One week would be set aside for decision review, and all eight readers will be involved with this review in two phases. Given we now aim for a specific NC/OOS split (as well as an even junior/sophomore split), we would pair up again with four readers reviewing NC and four reviewing OOS decisions. Decisions would be released on the currently planned date of Friday, April 4<sup>th</sup>.

One change from the first-year reading plan would be reviewing stragglers. Transfer applications can be more complex than first-years, and we do more follow-up with them to gather additional information. As a result, we are likely to have several hundred transfer applications to review after the April 4<sup>th</sup> decision release date. We advocate these applications be read once and then forwarded to another reader to review within the context of the decision review. If four readers each review NC and OOS, first-readers would then send their application to one of the four readers based on residency.

## 12 UPDATED READING CALENDAR

---

Here are a few of the major dates suggested for the reading calendar based on this reading proposal:

Tuesday, November 5<sup>th</sup>, 8:30am – Noon: possible extended reader training  
Monday, November 25<sup>th</sup> – interim D1 first-read deadline  
Monday, December 9<sup>th</sup>, 8am – all D1 first reads due  
Monday, December 9<sup>th</sup> – run projections/numbers for D1  
Tuesday, December 10<sup>th</sup> – extended R&R until Noon for D1 Decision/SGR training  
Tuesday, December 10<sup>th</sup> through Monday, January 6<sup>th</sup> at 8am – D1 Decision/SGR phase one  
Monday, January 6<sup>th</sup> – rerun projections/numbers for D2  
Tuesday, January 7<sup>th</sup> through Friday, January 17<sup>th</sup> – D1 Decision/SGR phase two  
Sometime after Tuesday, January 21<sup>st</sup> – D1 Decision Release (perhaps back to Jan. 24<sup>th</sup>).  
Monday, January 6<sup>th</sup> – D2 reading begins in earnest  
Monday, January 27<sup>th</sup> – interim D2 first-read deadline  
Monday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 8am – all D2 first reads due  
Monday, February 17<sup>th</sup> – run projections/numbers for D2  
Tuesday, February 18<sup>th</sup> – extended R&R until Noon for D2 Decision/SGR training  
Tuesday, February 18<sup>th</sup> – Thursday, March 6<sup>th</sup> at 8am – D2 Decision/SGR phase two  
Thursday, March 6<sup>th</sup> – rerun projections/numbers for D2  
Thursday, March 6<sup>th</sup> – transfer reader training & transfer reading begins  
Friday, March 7<sup>th</sup> – Tuesday, March 18<sup>th</sup> – D2 Decision/SGR phase two  
Friday, March 21<sup>st</sup> – D2 Decision Release  
Thursday, March 27<sup>th</sup> – transfer first reads due at 8am  
Thursday, March 27<sup>th</sup> – run projections/numbers for transfers  
Friday, March 28<sup>th</sup> through Wednesday, April 2<sup>nd</sup> at 8am – transfer decision review phase one  
Wednesday, April 2<sup>nd</sup> – rerun projections/numbers for transfers  
Wednesday April 2<sup>nd</sup> & Thursday, April 3<sup>rd</sup> – transfer decision review phase two  
Friday, April 4<sup>th</sup> – transfer decision release